UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES

The 830th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
Held on May 2, 2024 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter 227

A. ELECTIONS

1. PRESIDING OFFICER FOR THE YEAR 2024-2025
Nominee: Steven D. Brewer, Biology

Secretary Paik oversaw this election.

Further nominations were accepted from the floor.

No further nominations were made.

The nominations were closed.

Steven D. Brewer was re-elected as the Presiding Officer for the years 2024-2025 by acclamation

2. DELEGATE TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES POSITION FOR THE YEARS 2024-2026
Nominee: David Hoagland, Polymer Science and Engineering

Further nominations were accepted from the floor.

No further nominations were made.

The nominations were closed.

David Hoagland was re-elected as the Delegate to the Board of Trustees for the years 2024-2026 by acclamation.

B. PRESENTATIONS

1. UMass Flex 2.0 presented by Senior Vice Provost and Associate Chancellor Tilman Wolf, and Senior Vice Provost John Wells

Senior Vice Provost Wells: Good afternoon. We appreciate the time. We wanted to provide a brief update of where we are on UMass Flex. For those of you who were at the leadership retreat, this is a very similar presentation. One thing we wanted to stress was in "UMass Flex 1.0", was predicated on the concept of multi-modal classes. Classes that had two or more modes such as in person, live-online, and async online.

Moving forward, what we're calling "UMass Flex 2.0", we're pulling that back a bit in the interest of parsimony, particularly as students see this as an option for them to improve their experience.

We wanted to lead with two distinct types of courses, as you can see up here. An in-person class, and you can see that you can have options to live steam via zoom. Lecture captures through Echo, blended, hybrid, things of that nature. Then online, asynchronous or synchronous, which should that make sense to the subject matter.

So each slot is a distinct course. So what we'll be assuming is that, depending on where the student is in their degree journey, they may be looking at entirely in person, they may need an online class and something that would make sense given where they are in their in their pathway. So the Flexibility comes from the course selection. And we're using these pictograms with both red and blue to sort of highlight when we expect to see these blue options, if you will, coming into play for students at various stages of the curriculum.

This is a sort of what we call the learner continuum. And this tantalizes the student lens. And we have personas on either end are kind of our sort of bounded personas.

And then we can start to support personas in between. The one thing we wanted to stress is the elevator pitch reflects moving forward in the most simple and basic terms, is "Flex is anything that is an alternative to the full time Amherst residential experience." That can include going to Mount Ida, it can include starting in London or Madrid. Any of those options as well as online.

But, as you can see in these personas, whether it's Marcus that's using online as part of a work schedule, Elena doing an internship and their junior year maybe finishing online, Camden coming to campus at the tail end to really take advantage of in person learning to fill out their degree.

At the leadership retreat, we handed out worksheets for every school and college to look at where they see some opportunities. We're not expecting everyone to sort of fully Flex their degree with online options. Soup to nuts is more of a you know, in the interest of parsimony, maybe it's on the start. Maybe it's somewhere in the middle, which we call Flex-ship, or maybe it's at the end, Flex-finishe. We did get some stats, as you can see here. These are very high level as to where various schools and colleges saw some of these opportunities, where they didn't see opportunities. And this is, I think, a way we want to proceed where we can do it kind of incrementally and if it makes sense for the subject matter to do something entirely online that you can see on the right, then we'll, you know, definitely support that.

But it can vary by program vary by school and college. And we want to provide the Flexibility within UMass Flex to support that.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: And the Flexibility really is from picking blue courses at the right spot. And so what we're currently doing is we're meeting all the Deans to talk about where they think, in their curricula and their departments, there might be places where it makes sense to intentionally pick several blue courses. So that when students who go off to do an internship, they can still take the online version of those courses in their third year, all semester.

Those percentages show that departments think that there are opportunities throughout the curriculum where we can do it, but not every program will have every option. So option availability is totally dependent on the program. Each department should decide what's right for them. If they know that in the senior year the students need to be here because they need to do a senior design project in engineering, of course we're not offering them the Flex finish.

So this is something that departments decide and departments should be intentional about which courses they need. Some of those blue courses may be across departments, Junior Year Writing, maybe a GenEd.

So there's opportunities for departments even to just offer a single course because it helps other departments. If you have a course with multiple sections, you would move one of them online, see how many students want to take it, the rest would still be in person. So this is something that can be progressively rolled in.

Couple minor things about implementation. One thing we have to do is we have to distinguishes the types of online courses that we have because we have the U+ courses, which are for students that are coming from the outside and who are paying extra tuition. And we have our internal student that have traditionally registered in the university section.

One of the big problems we've had is that we double charged our students who wanted to take online courses because they had to enroll in the U+ section. We're trying to get rid of that by creating an extra blue section here that is considered to be part of the University section, and therefore students can enroll in it as if it was a regular course, and they don't have to go cross the boundary into U+ where they have to pay extra.

That raises a couple of questions about how you set the seat count and the enrollment, and I don't want to go into too much detail unless somebody asks me about it. But basically, what you can do is you can have a total capacity limit, just like in a traditional course, and you split it across those 2 sections, and the students get filled in over time in a way that makes sense both for the on-campus students as well as for the U+ students. And so you end up with the same enrollment. You still have control over how many students you have. They're just filled with that, with a cohort of university online students and U+ online students.

And it should be indistinguishable for the faculty member what kind of students they have. The goal of that is that you can start with your on-campus curriculum. You can selectively add a few online courses that help our own students be more successful because they can do more things. And by doing that you can then also add outside students that bring in revenue and thereby expand the overall revenue to the campus and to your department. As we said, we're currently going around talking to the colleges about what causes make sense. The

ideas team is finding a course design institute to help faculty to think about how to develop high quality online courses. The plan is to start rolling this into the system in January 2025, for the spring, 2025 semester.

Questions:

Senator Olsen: What would be, if you were teaching one of these new online courses in this fall or spring, what is the minimum number of students in order for it to make? Because when you teach now at university without walls, or continuing ed, there's a minimum to have a go. But if someone's doing it on load as part of their assigned courses in the fall or spring, what happens if there's only 4 people enrolled?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: So what we're trying to get to just as a high level answer is that a course is a course. It doesn't matter if it's in person. It doesn't matter if it's online. And ideally, we would like to get to a way where it's just you or your department's course, and you're teaching it, and the workload should be handled the same. If it's an online course or an on-campus course, and if you teach it overload, there should be some reward for that.

That means also that we would like to apply the same rules for on campus courses as for the online courses in terms of what the minimum enrollment is. You have a few more knaps here because you can set different seat counts for the online session and U+ session. So that's something where you and your department can think about. Do we want to attract students from the outside and have them bring in additional revenue. You want to have more seats for the on-campus students because you want to support their learning. But it's not directly new revenue for you. So you can play around with that. But the goal is to have the same rules for these online courses as for the on-campus courses, because they're basically just a course you are offering that just happens to be online.

Senior Vice Provost Wells: This particular strategy that you're seeing, hopefully, will increase the number of online courses that we can offer. As you said, a lot of times we have to cancel, because there's not enough demand in the pure off campus online space. This, by allowing campus students to take this, makes more courses viable

It benefits the campus students as well as increasing our offering in the off campus online space.

Co-President Weinbaum: My question is about the administrative side, because a course is a course makes sense. But one thing that's different between old CPE, UWW courses, and on campus courses is the revenue that comes to departments, and many of our departments rely on that revenue to hire staff, to run programs, faculty professional development, ability to travel all of those things rely on that revenue. I know from your slides that for the first year there's some assurance that the revenue will be maintained. What happens after that first year, and in particular, what happens to faculty and staff who are being paid through those revenue streams?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: So you're right at the in the future we will only collect additional revenue from the U+ students over the revenue that the University gets with a regular tuition. In terms of what that means for a department in terms of accounting is that there is revenue coming into U+.

And on this side you have student credit hours, because those are basically the metric that we use in the regular budget process, through the Deans and through the Provost to ask for additional investments in the department based on teaching stress and so on. So it forks off into two different processes to bring the resources to the department.

Senior Vice Provost Wells: I'd also like to stress that if we're successful with this, we are going to be able to meet students where they are a lot better than we currently can. Which, if we do it correctly, should grow enrollment and that enrollment growth should benefit the schools and colleges on the revenue generation side as well. I do think in the interim, Tilman's pointing out, is you're going to be sensitive to any gaps in that. But our long-term goal is to grow.

Senator Messier: My question is how this is going to affect services that aren't specifically in a course. So, for example, the libraries aren't open 24/5 anymore. How are librarians going to support students who are possibly in a Pacific time zone or international? How is this going to be, you know, supported by folks in the LRC, the writing center, areas that are staffed by faculty and librarians, but not traditionally supporting courses as being taught?

I'm concerned about those hours. And also as a liaison to a very large, already large school in Isenberg, how much more workload is going to be asked of me and my fellow liaisons to support online courses as well as in-person courses?

Senior Vice Provost Wells: Yes, so the Flex, as an initiative, is an integrative initiative. So we want to provide the student services that are appropriate to students regardless of where they are. That's going to require resources. Once again, I'll go back to if we're successful and going, we should have revenue to be able to invest in that. I will also say that you know we will be have to be sensitive to time zones. But if you look at online education, the vast majority of students are within a radius because they want to be associated with an institution that is, you know, within their professional proximity, whether it's Boston, New York, etc. But so the time zones are something that we're going to we want to be sensitive to and it's going to take some nuance.

But when it comes to the student services. The nice thing about this initiative is, if we're successful, whether it's tutoring, whether it's, you know you fill in the blank and what the service is, access to library services, that helps the quality of our programs. Because a lot of online programs highlighted, they don't have those services, and that hurts when you're looking at people that assess, program quality.

I think if we can focus on that and I think that's something that's going to be going to be core to what we're trying to do with Flex. But we definitely want to listen to you and your needs and be able to get a good sense of what those resource needs are so we can plan for it, invest in it, and, support those students accordingly.

Professor Toussaint Losier: I have a like very simple question hopefully. I apologize because I came in here a little bit late, so it might have already been addressed. The question of UMass Flex 2.0 being proposed, at least in a couple of other venues, and a question that's been in the back of my mind as someone who's been at UMass for, say, the past nine years or so, but especially over the experience of the pandemic, there really seemed to be an emphasis amidst the pandemic, or coming out of it in terms of actually moving away from online education and towards in person education, and that seemed to be one driven by, not by faculty, in fact, there were a number of faculty who were like, I'm fine teaching remotely or whatever, but actually by students and their parents saying, we really want to see the value of a college education being in-person brick and mortar college experience.

What what's the motivation for within just a couple years of that pivoting towards expanding online education? And what's the evidence that you're drawing on to support what is essentially kind of a hypothesis that there's actually a demand for this kind of educational product?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Yes, thank you for that question. That's a really important point. Let me answer it by saying that there's different levels of how much online you take. And our baseline assumption is that unless there's a program for which this really makes sense, we're trying to stay on this side. But the all-red solution may not be what students need to be successful in our mostly residential program. Right? They may need the occasional online course, because the schedule doesn't work out otherwise, or because they have a semester where they want to do an experience-learning activity somewhere outside campus while still making progress. So we're trying to be really intentional about where to put the online experience and not go all the way over there unless that is something that students really want and the market supports.

And let me have one more thing. So because we have this set up here, and we can distinguish students in our curriculum who take online courses versus regular courses because they're distinct on Spire. We can enforce policies that say, first semester student, you can take either 0 or one online courses or international student, you're actually not allowed to take more than one online course because of visa requirements. And so we can collectively decide what these policies should be, so that we can ensure student success. And so that students have that experience that you want them to have, which is the residential experience on our campus And so we can collectively decide what these policies should be, so that we can ensure student success. And so that students have that experience that you want them to have, which is the residential experience on our campus that still allows us to bring outside students in for the occasional course that they want to take entirely online, and therefore bringing in additional revenue. But it doesn't, you know, devalue, the experience that the students have who are on campus.

Senior Vice Provost Wells: I'd like to talk about the evidence. So, prior to the pandemic, we commissioned a study from Hanover research to ask about students preference for multiple modes in learning, and then in discussing it with then Chancellor Subaswammy, he and I said we'd run this after the pandemic. Was there a preference for online? It went up right, and we didn't ask the parents. We asked the students, right? And that's who the survey sample was. But it wasn't all or nothing. It wasn't kind of a false binary, like, I like all online, or I like all in person, what they really liked. And this is what the survey, and I'm happy to share that these survey results because we actually had, kind of you know, pre-pandemic post-pandemic direct comparisons, was that the ability to you know, maximize their campus experience, ability to engage in a research project with a professor. I took that one online class. It really freed up my schedule. I was able to fit that in.

They were able to tailor their on-campus experience and online options gave them that power. Right? So that's one thing and the other thing I think, that we wanted to stress is that students are already voting with their feet on this. We have a form that they fill out to get access to U+ right now, this is part of the double charging that Tillman's talking about, and we're getting healthy number of students that are doing this DIY, if you will. We would like to formalize it more as part of an initiative that we can track, you know, and be able to manage more effectively.

Senator Olsen: One follow up. What is the impact, or how are you calculating student fees? If they are a predominantly online student and take one class in person. Does that trigger full fees? Because that's a big part of our revenue as well as tuition.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Very simple answer. So you see the dashed line? If you're on the left side of it, you're in the university session, and your tuition is charged the way we charge students in university sessions. So in the online course section here costs you the same as a seat in person.

Senator Olsen: No, sorry. I'm thinking of fees. So I'm thinking, the opposite, you're mainly online, and then you decide to take one in-person course to see what it's like. Does that trigger student health student, you know all these different fees?

Senior Vice Provost Wells: You basically are a part-time in-person student for those 3 or 4 credits that you're taking. And the fees are accordingly.

Senator Olsen: Is that prorated then?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: I don't know the answer.

Senator Trim: I'm just trying to understand the money. So my question is genuinely, I just, I want to make sure I get it. I'm struggling with the definition for what constitutes an online-only student. And let me explain why I'm asking.

So if I understood what you said before about revenue to departments, and correct me if I don't have this right, what I heard was the first year you're gonna let things happen pretty much as they have. But moving forward, there's gonna be this distinction where, if departments offer online courses and therefore their existing regular earned variety already here, UMass students and those are basically on-load. They might be online versus in a physical classroom. But they're basically on-load, right? Like, there's 4 sections of this class, 2 of them are online, 2 of them are in this building over here. But they're all just part of our office. Do I have that right?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Yes.

Senator Trim: Okay. So second part of the question. So how do we then get the class that generates the revenue. Who is the student that's in the class? And here's why I'm asking. So if you're, and maybe I'm saying the wrong thing, and I mean no offense, but my presumption is most online-only programs are not ranked as highly as residential programs.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Yes.

Senator Trim: And so if you are happen to be in a highly ranked residential program, right, in your field, what incentive do you have to have online-only students in that program? Are you essentially, then, offering an online only version of your major in order to compete with those other online-only degrees? And is it only those students who are able to generate revenue for your department?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Yes, good question. There's two answers to how we generate revenue, and the chancellor's really adamant that I can answer those. The more subtle one is that if you look at this, there's different semesters where students are not on campus. And the idea is to backfill those seats by increasing the total headcount of our on-campus students, or our traditional students if you will. We have limitations on how many we can accommodate in-person here, and when students go away we can bring in more students. So that's total additional revenue to the campus, that goes to traditional departments that have teaching stress.

If you then offer an exciting course, I hear you're interested in artificial intelligence, right? Let's say you have a really exciting course. There might be students from the outside that say, 'Hey, this is really great. I might wanna take the online section that you're already offering', and we add a few seats to those, and those bring additional revenue in. If that starts growing into a certificate in AI or something else, then you can have more and more sustained U+ students that bring in that additional revenue. So there's 2 paths forward to bring in these additional

students.

Senator Trim: That's super helpful. Thank you. So just to clarify what I'm hearing is in order for me to generate revenue from my department by teaching online, I pretty much need to be working towards or have an online degree that I'm marketing as an online-certificate, online-academic program that I'm marketing and trying to recruit for as an online program.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: That is kind of the most ambitious way of bringing in additional revenue. It can start with a single course. It can also be just focused on the students that are on campus because they do these activities here, and therefore the total enrollment for your department goes up which comes with resources.

Senior Vice Provost Wells: I also just wanna emphasize that the investment in a high-quality online course isn't just fall and spring. Offer it in winter session, offer it in summer session, and that does generate revenue.

Senator Trim: So these online students that might take my super amazing AI class and make money for my department, are they full time online program students in another program in the university? Or are they just randos that want to do college?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: So, if they are students in in another program at the university, they are on the left side of those 2 block boxes, and they bring in traditional tuition, not U+ tuition.

Senator Trim: Thank you.

Senator Kalmakis: So our college, Nursing, we have both. We offer exclusively online, exclusively in person. We have students, undergraduates, who want to take a graduate course while undergraduate, but those are all online or 99% of them. So that's a problem for us. We have faculty who teach across the 2 programs. In fact, I don't know of many who don't. So we're teaching both online and in person. So that's a problem for us with that kind of bifurcation.

We're trying to say online or in-person, they're not managed the same way. I'm wondering if you're considering in the future, cause it seems to me that it'll be harder and harder to draw lines here, and that there's a lot of gray where some people might wanna take an online course and an in-person course, and later. So I'm just not so sure that we're thinking about it in a futuristic way when we create this line.

The other point is, it's harmful to our students, because in the graduate program we have one graduate doctoral program that is exclusively online. Our students may not TA because we have no way to compensate them for being a TA. So they're excluded from TA-ing. And yet our in-person doctoral students are given that benefit. So I'm concerned about also about that.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: I'm gonna give a slightly wishy-washy answer in the sense that everything we talked about was focused on the undergrad program because it's the easiest to explain. The graduate program is a little trickier, because U+ encompasses also in person programs that are U+ because they have a different tuition model. And so I'm happy to meet with you and talk through the details. One thing I can point out, if you set this online, the left section to 0 seats, you're basically back to what we have today. So it's not that we couldn't accommodate some of the existing programs with this particular model.

Senator Kalmakis: So for the undergrads, though my point was, and sorry I did digress into just graduate school. But for the undergrads we do offer to let them take some of these graduate courses, the 500 levels. And it's very difficult for them to do that in our school.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Okay let's talk more and figure out how we can accommodate so that it matches as closely to your existing program as possible.

Senator Kalmakis: Thank you.

Senator Modenos: I wanna say that the folks in the U+ session, there are a few thousand 100% online UMass students. They're not outside students or random folks coming in. They're 100% online UMass students that are getting their degrees from UMass, they just happen to be online. Nursing, Interdisciplinary Studies, PBA, Eisenberg I think, Stockbridge, couple of others. And because we're so great, we help UMass earn top 20 in the US News world ranking for online degrees. So the majority of students taking U+ during the academic year are our students. Winter and summer, are, I think, both our students and traditional on-campus students. So I just wanted to specify that.

Senator Liberatore: I came in a little late because I was teaching in person, so forgive me if you already answered this. Can't you already do this like, you can concurrently run an online section and an online U+ section. So I'm confused, what's different?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: The problem that we have is that currently with if you have an online course that's in U+ students that are already paying, say, past the 12 credits of tuition in their undergraduate program, then have to pay extra to take the online version or the online section of that course.

What we're trying to do is harmonize the system, so that the students who pay regular tuition stay, you know, in that model of tuition payment, and then U+ are the true revenue generating students. The other thing that we can do with this is we can ensure that we apply policies. I'm not sure if you heard it about international students and how many online courses we want students to take so they have a good residential experience, which is much more difficult to do if we don't know exactly where they are.

Senator Liberatore: But operationally, the part I'm confused about is you could run section one, university online section 2, U+ and have them be concurrent. Right? Like the same class. So why do we need this? That's what I'm trying to understand.

Associate Chancellor Wolf: Again, it's what we charge our students. Right now, if somebody wants the online version of that section, they need to pay extra, in short.

Senator Liberatore: But wouldn't they take either U+ or university online depending on what's appropriate for them?

Associate Chancellor Wolf: So you're saying, you take your residential course and make it online. You need Farshid's approval, because you know, we don't offer online courses unless we're intentional about it. And so by doing it this way, we basically put those it in the left bucket.

Senior Vice Provost Wells: The main reason is that subsection on the left doesn't exist today. By having it as an online session within the university session is we're gonna have policies that we're gonna be discussing like, how many online courses do we wanna allow undergraduates to take. That allows us to manage it, right? We have student visa issues. We have other things that come into play. And without that explicit session we can't manage it. So it doesn't exist today. This is going to, as planned right now, kick off in Spring 25, but it does give us a very intentional place to put the online offerings that fall under the traditional tuition model so students don't get double charged. Don't have to hop over into U+ to grab those courses.

2. Organizational Review Project presented by Vice Provost Deborah Gould

Vice Provost Gould: Thank you for inviting me here. Today I'm going to talk briefly about the organizational review project that we are undertaking or just beginning. And, by the way. I have not done this presentation before, so I am not as practiced as Tillman and John. So bear with me.

I'm going to start with our definition of the organizational review. The definition is a comprehensive assessment of administrative needs and support across the academic areas and related central functions, and within each individual area. And for the purposes of this we're defining administrative as HR, Finance, IT, pre-award, and post-award. It does not include instructional support and doesn't include advising support or other support functions that exist within the academic areas.

With that said, all of these are the academic units within academic affairs, with one exception. This does not include the College of Natural Sciences because they've already undergone their own organizational review. And then, in addition to academic affairs, we have the 4 executive areas of administration and finance, human resources, information technology and research and engagement. Now, these are not all of the executive areas on campus, but these are the 4 that interface most close closely with the administrative functions that I mentioned before. So areas like student affairs and campus life, or UR, we certainly overlap with them, but not in those administrative functions.

So what are we looking to achieve? So in a nutshell, we are hoping to improve service on the campus. A truly effective administrative structure does not have a great deal of complexity. It's streamlined. It provides for temporary coverage when somebody is ill or on vacation, and it also provides for resiliency. In other words, there is a succession plan. So if someone leaves permanently, you're not stuck with wondering 'what are we going to do?' The second big piece is to improve opportunities for staff. Again, an ideal administrative structure provides staff with onboarding, training, professional development, and clear opportunities for career paths and career succession. So those are the 2 main goals that we have, our vision for this project.

So what is the project? It's an opportunity to listen and learn. So we have, with the help of our partners, Seagull Consultants, they are conducting one on one and group interviews with approximately 900 faculty, staff, and administrators. And then they're also collecting financial data, organizational charts, administrative processes, service level metrics and pulling that all together and allowing us to really look at what we have, understand the differences and the similarities across the units, and then take what we've learned to think really broadly and with an open mind about organizational structure.

What the project is not. It is not a project with a foregone conclusion. We are not doing this because we think this is what we need as an administrative structure so we're going to hire these consultants who are going to come in and tell us what we want to hear. That's not what this is. It's also not a vehicle to create a one size fits all solution. We know there are specialized units around campus that have specialized needs, and the goal is to listen to those needs. And finally, but most importantly, it is in no way an attempt to reduce staffing. We do not think we are overstaffed. So this this is not an attempt for that.

So I mentioned Seagull, our partners. So what will they be doing? They are going to be conducting the interviews. They're going to be collecting and analyzing the data. And then they're going to do some assessments identifying gaps, looking at career paths, professional development practices, and in the end provide us with a report that summarizes all of their findings, and they will provide recommendations to address the needs surfaced in the assessment. But that's where it ends. They're providing recommendations, but they're not providing answers, and they're not telling us what we need to do. This is just a document that allows us to look at what they have found and make our own decisions about what if anything, should we do about this?

Estimated timeline. We did have the first kickoff meeting with the Chancellor and the steering committee that happened in April. The consultants are starting to collect the information, collect a list of the information that they need from us. So information gathering. Then beginning in June, they're going to start the interviews. And so June, July and August, it will be the administrative units. And then September, through March those interviews will be with the academic units. since they'll be more likely to get people here. And then the final report is anticipated to come out May. So a year long, it's going to take about a year. So again, this is estimated. hope the timeline doesn't slip. But I know how these projects go, so we'll see. Try to stick to it as much as we can.

I wanted to talk to you about guiding principles for this project. So the first is really to listen. Listen to the voices, as many voices as possible, and not, you know, not just to to say oh, they had their say and not pay attention to what they're saying. But to really listen and pay attention to the data. I mean, data provides as much information as the voices do. So having both the data and the people is a powerful combination. We also want to provide various opportunities for input. So the consultants are saying that they were going to individually or in groups talk to 900 people. Well, there are 3,300 faculty and staff in the areas that are involved in this review. So what we would like to do is have opportunities for people to express opinions through either web forms or other meetings that we can attend, which brings me to the last point, which is, we plan to be transparent in this process, and happy to come to meetings. If you want to invite me or someone else back to talk about where we are sometime during next year. Happy to do that. We'll have a website that we can post where things stand. But the whole goal is to make sure that we are letting people know how the project is progressing.

Finally, who is going to make sure we follow these guiding principles. This is the steering committee. It's a mix of administrators, staff, faculty, and you know, thank you to PSU and U.S.A. who have provided suggested members for the committee. They're also represented. And so any one of these people should, you know, should you have a question, want to talk to them, they should be able to provide you with information.

Senator Liberatore: I have 2 questions. One, what is this little operation gonna cost? Do you have an estimate? And then 2. Can you talk a little bit about how this relates to, or similar or different to the recent CNS Strives process? Thank you.

Vice Provost Gould: So the project is $600,000 split across the units, and it is similar to CNS Strives, except that we are including the other executive areas. So when looking at HR, we're going to be looking at HR the whole process, not just
the HR pieces that are done in the individual use units, because that'll only get you so far. So that's really the biggest difference.

Senator Losier: Could you say a little bit more about what data is gonna be collected? Having worked previously with consultants that do these kind of reviews, there's questions of like time studies, or comparison between like parallel institutions or similarly situated institutions or units. And I'm just curious in terms of if similar data is gonna be collected along those lines.

Vice Provost Gould: My expectation and I haven't gotten the data request yet, but my expectation is they'll be looking

for org charts. They may be looking for some job descriptions. They'll be looking for service metrics, you know travel process, purchase orders entered. We are hopeful that they will have benchmarks for those, although benchmarks are tricky because everyone's a little different. But we should be able to compare ourselves against ourselves. So with those types of metrics.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Vice Provost Gould for the presentation. I appreciate it. So under the Wellman document, the Senate has the privilege of providing advice on matters of the budget. I'm wondering if you could articulate the ways in which Senate may engage with this particular steering committee in terms of providing advice.

Vice Provost Gould: Well, first of all I would expect that the consultants will, if you're not on the list for them to interview, you will be on that list. But secondly, like I said, I'm happy to come to any meeting. If you want regular updates to the Rules Committee, that's fine. And like, I said, we are happy to take feedback. So any feedback you have would be welcome.

Secretary Paik: Great, thank you.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **Principal Administrative Officers**
2. **The Secretary of the Faculty Senate**
3. **The Chair of the Rules Committee**
4. **The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees**
5. **The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors**
6. **The President of the Graduate Student Senate**
7. **The President of the Student Government Association**
8. **The Student Trustee**

D. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Briggs: So I think I am not alone among the faculty in feeling deeply troubled by what I'm seeing on social media, which looks like the criminalization of peaceful protest across the country. Particularly the events at UCLA, where Goon Squad seemed to attack sleeping protesters. And I am, on the one hand, deeply relieved that nothing like that happened here. On the other hand, given the sheer number of police, State police, local police, UMPD, who were here, it seems to me that the only reason that didn't happen here was actually the wise decisions of the students.

And I've heard a couple of things through the emails that have troubled me. One of them is the notion that disruptive speech is not protected speech. And while I'm not a lawyer, I do teach the history of the first amendment, and it seems to me that the courts have drawn exceptions to the first amendment very narrowly, and said, 'the things you can't say are obscenity, defamation, fraud, incitement, fighting words, true threats, speech integral to criminal conduct, and child pornography'. Speech that is effective as protest is frequently disruptive, whether we like it or not. And furthermore, I also heard from Mike Owen's email that because Chancellor Reyes is new at this institution, we're not bound by the pattern and practice of this institution, and it's perfectly acceptable to now criminalize behavior that we've previously tolerated, including the setting up of an encampment for housing last year, and of course, some years ago the extended encampment in support of Occupy. And I have not seen anything in the court records that suggests that that is the case, that new leadership means that we're not bound by institutional patterns and practices, and I would hold up the words of the ACLU, 'if University has routinely tolerated violations of its rules and suddenly enforces them harshly in a specific context, singling out particular views for punishment, the fact that the policy is formally neutral on its face does not make viewpoint-based enforcement permissible.'

And so I wanted to push back a little bit on the ways that it seems to me that the Administration has limited the purview of what constitutes free speech at this institution. But more profoundly because I seem to be talking to a lot of students who are involved in the protests. I'm struck by how profoundly alienated they are right now. They're talking about Kent State. They believe that they're in danger of being beaten or killed.

We are in the midst of decision season. They're calling home and saying, 'Don't come to UMass', and I don't know how typical the students that I'm talking to are. But nevertheless, I want to report that that feeling is profoundly out there, and I'm definitely hearing it.

And I look around to our north and our South. I see Dartmouth, where my friend Annalie Zorlick, 65 years old, was observing the protest and thrown to the ground by the police. Seems to me that that's the danger of engaging the police in these kinds of situations; that you immediately lose control of the situation, and whatever the Dartmouth

Administration thought, that's what happened. And she's now banned from campus for a year. She's worked there for 40 years. She couldn't be more, well, I wanna say loyal to the institution, she's defended Dartmouth when I thought it wasn't defensible. And then I looked to the South to the institution that from which I got my PhD, to Brown, and I see them engaged in a deep negotiation with protesters, and I want to ask as somebody who, during the South African Divestment period, was on a committee that discussed divestment. If we cannot in this institution find a format in which students, faculty, and administrators can talk about these concerns.

When I came here 10 years ago there was no Department of Defense research happening here. It seems to me that the accusation is floating, or the belief is floating around that we do. Certainly the partnership with Raytheon is troubling to people. I'm not a member of, obviously, Students for Justice in Palestine, nor am I a member of Faculty for Justice in Palestine, so I don't speak for anybody except me. But I am deeply concerned about the status of free speech, which I feel like was really on the verge of being breached here, and has certainly been- is being criminalized across the country at a moment when we are on the brink of an election that I fear may be decided in the streets and may be to be decided through protest. I feel like there's a lot at stake in what's going on right now-

Presiding Officer Brewer: Can you please come to your question?

Senator Briggs: My question is can we find a format in which students, faculty, and administrators can discuss the demands of the students? Thank you.

Chancellor Reyes: Thank you for the question, and that has been the proposal every day. And we want to sit down and talk about it. Talk about it. Not be yelled at. Not be cursed at. Talk about it! We can co-create a space where we can talk about it. That has been the offer since last fall.

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I would say the Senate obviously can try to play a role, as our Student Affairs and University Life Council met yesterday, and there was a discussion that occurred between Vice Chancellor Perdomo-Ahmed and people asked questions. It was, maybe it's not clear that everyone's happy with what the answers or there was, you know. But it was a conversation. I think there could be more of those. Thank you.

Rena Marthaler (Undergraduate Student): I am a sophomore at this university, and I'm representing a group of students who have questions on a similar topic. We have countless times attempted to approach Chancellor Reyes, as well as other administrative officers, regarding these questions, and have been mostly refused the opportunity or refused commentary on these questions.

So, Chancellor, we want to know why haven't you committed to divesting from war profiteers, while 70% of the student body voted supporting it? The SGA election provided very clear results that the vast majority of students at this university voted in support of divestment and yet we have not heard of any action or steps.

I don't know if it was us you may have been referring to when you say that "you do not want to be yelled at when we have these conversations." We also do not want to yell. I believe the students voices are tired, and we want to know why it takes getting to an encampment and then officers to take down the encampment for these questions to be discussed?

Chancellor Reyes: With respect to the divestment question, the questions and the demands from the students, they asked from my office for response on the 25th of April. We have sent that response. It's all available to all of you. You have seen it in the email. They asked for it in writing. We gave it in writing. So the question has been asked, and the answer has been provided.

Iris Earl (Undergraduate Student): I am an undergraduate, second year. I just want to ask, Chancellor Reyes, 40,000 people are dead in Gaza. Universities, hospitals, homes, all leveled. Why does the university continue to not even use the word "Palestine" in official communication? Let alone condemn the occupation, apartheid, and genocide committed by the U.S.-backed Israeli forces?

Addison Damish (Undergraduate Student): I am a second year here. I just had a question about the UMass 57. Chancellor, why have you still not dropped the charges on the UMass 57 after committing to do so at the meeting you had with some students last semester?

Chancellor Reyes: With the UMass 57, we said that we're following a process. The students have submitted for the review. Even this past Tuesday, we have been waiting for the submittal that I think hopefully, this last Tuesday was the final submission for the review. Then the review we will start.

It's a process looking at all the information that is provided. So I've actually talked to some of the faculty about it. They were going to communicate back to the students that it's a process. It's ongoing and it just takes time.

Secretary Paik: Point of Order. I think it's fine to provide applause when, for example, someone is leaving the university. But, as I articulated earlier in this meeting, let's have this debate with questions and answers. There's no need to engage in snapping or applause. Thank you.

Toby [No Last Name Given] (Undergraduate Student): I am an undergraduate here at UMass. My question is that the university motto is, "be revolutionary." We say we are working towards the common good and for a better world. There is a massacre happening right now in Gaza, and we are still continuing to choose to partner with Raytheon and other corporations that profit off of and arm this massacre. I would like some clarification as to why the university is still continuing that partnership with Raytheon, and still continuing these partnerships with Raytheon during a genocide, during a massacre when our slogan is "be revolutionary"? And when on the UMass website, it says, we are working towards the common good? Thank you.

Secretary Paik: Point of Order. Thank you, Presiding Officer. Can you clarify the expectations for questions and answers? If, for example, if someone has already asked the question, what would be the rules in your opinion?

Presiding Officer Brewer: In general, our process has been to allow people to ask questions and the Administration, or somebody from the Senate is able to respond. In general, I've tried to use a very light hand. I'm not sure that I want to see the same question asked over and over again. But I've not heard the exact same question asked over and over again. In general, I think our process has been to allow people to ask the questions that they have.

Secretary Paik: Thank you.

Professor Toussaint Losier: I am a professor in the department of African American studies. This is question is to both the Chancellor and the Provost. I noted in both of the communications that we received from your offices this week, there were references to the land use policy, and the fact that the tent encampment that was established near the library was in violation of the land use policy.

Being a diligent scholar, I went to the land use policy and looked it up. I was particularly curious, in terms of where references to structures are in the land use policy. I provide just two copies of it for you guys to look at. I'm just curious if you could identify a location in a land use policy where there's reference to structures other than in regards to construction.

I'm just curious if the only way in which the land use policy, or an imagined violation of the land use policy, is in regards to putting up unauthorized structures is, if the only reference to those structures is in regards to construction, how you all understood tents that were put up, or what have you, to be a violation of the land use policy?

I also have a question to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. If we're in a situation where there's a possibility that the code of student conduct, or other policies within university, are being used as a way to deter, or encourage people not to engage in different forms of free speech, and particularly free speech that officers of the university are not inclined to receive well, is it possible for the Faculty Senate to establish a committee that can review, at least during the course of this academic year, how decisions have been made? Either in terms of threatening students with violations of the code of student conduct or actually finding students responsible for the code of student conduct? Particularly in response to student protests or student activism?

I say that not just because of some of the questions that have been asked earlier today. But I'm aware that, as of last month, the Office of Civil Rights and the Department of Education have opened an investigation of UMass Amherst in regards to potential Title VI violations. Particularly in regards to anti-Palestinian or anti-Arab bias and to the degree that is possible.

So, is it possible for there to be some sort of committee set up within the Faculty Senate to review how student protest has been handled on campus? And whether or not the new precedents that have been established in terms of how to handle student protests are actually reflect a fair implementation of the code of student conduct?

Vice Chancellor Mangels: On the question about construction, we use the land use policy, not just for construction, but for erecting any kind of a structure that's going to be on campus. We ask people to fill out a land use form, and this is something we've done for decades that we can look at to ensure that it won't be in an area that might have electrical conduits. That it would also be a place where it would not impede either vehicular or pedestrian traffic. So we've always consistently asked for anything that's going to be erected, or it's going to be drilling, putting holes in the ground, driving stakes into the ground, that they check with us so that we can make sure that it's a safe environment for people who are putting the structures up.

Secretary Paik: Thank you for the question. I'll try to provide a response based on my understanding of the Wellman document and also the charges of the Standing Councils and Committees of Faculty Senate. So under the Wellman document, the faculty's primary responsibility is on academic matters. The traditional role of the Senate is engaged in looking at courses and programs and looking at academic policies. At our university, the student code of conduct and

things like the land use policy don't fall under academic matters.

Historically, the Senate did pass the original picketing policy. We're talking decades ago. But it's current status is that it's not a Senate policy. It's an administrative policy. The council that may provide advice to Administration in terms of maybe perhaps making recommendations along these lines would be the Student Affairs and University Life Council. Which has, as part of its charge, historically dealt with issues related to first amendment issues.

So there is a council that can provide advice. But I think your question was more along the lines of the implementation of the policy. I see that primarily as an administrative matter. I could anticipate, maybe the faculty might get invited to be on such a committee, but it's primarily a matter of Administration in my opinion.

Arnesh [No Last Name Given] (Graduate Student): I'm a master student from the department of Computer Science. The UMass Administration has maintained that its hands are tied, and it cannot divest from war profiteering because it provides employment and that it funds research. My question is, in 2018 fossil fuel companies in the university also funded research and provided employment, but the university chose to divest when students took action against fossil fuels. So the question is, why are there these double standards when it comes to war profiteers? And why does UMass claim to uphold the voices of revolutionary students when it continues to repress and suppress and stand against the student movement at this university?

Chancellor Reyes: I want to first say thank you to all of you and most importantly, those students. This is the first time that we can have a conversation. This is the first time that we can sit down and have a conversation. I hope that this type of conversations we can have. Questions that are being asked, we can provide answers. The answers may not be what we all like and we will have to, then, work on that issue.

But the fact that this is the first time that we can talk to each other. That there's no one offending anyone. I just want to congratulate those students for taking that, the faculty members for asking the question, my team for taking those questions, and this Faculty Senate, for being able to be responsive to this.

This is the behavior that has made UMass different. If you look at what has been happening for the past week or 2 weeks across the nation, I think we have a lot to be grateful for.

Because we have level heads from the students and from the Administration. You can continue to say that there was police; you can continue to say that. That will be a conversation for the time.

There were four police officers on site. I'm not going to go into debate on any of that. This is not a debate. It's a questions and answer.

Now I will answer the question about divestment. Divestment is a different word then cutting ties with everything. We still have companies that have fossil fuel connections on our campus with which we do research. For which our students can go work, and they come to the career fair. Divestment is different from that. I understand, and I please would ask the students to know, and remember that, they have already made a petition to the foundation to look at that divestment. They have already made that petition to the foundation. I want to leave that question there. Thank you.

Liam [No Last Name Given] (Undergraduate Student): I am from the biology department. I'm an undergraduate at UMass Amherst. And I would like someone to confirm. The first part of my question is, I was wondering whether the reason the protests, whether because they were disbanded or unauthorized, was that simply just because we didn't get approval through a form?

Chancellor Reyes: With respect to the question, there was, first of all, no dismantlement of any protest in this campus. Let's start by saying that. We all read the same emails that we sent out. We all read the transcript that was given to the students; that was read to the students. It was, “your protest can stay, your voice can continue to be heard. The only thing that we cannot have is the tents.”

By the way, if you want to have tables, if you want to have a canopy, you can request through the land use policy.

We actually allow them to use the land use policy when we usually have 10 days notice. we took the form to them and said, “if you submit this form, we can have this.”

So they requested the land use space. They have filled out the form. They're using the space from 10 to 5 yesterday, today, and tomorrow. We are all following the policies. Their voices are being heard. They can have their teachings, they can have their sit downs, they can have their speakers, they can have that there. The space is theirs. This is not about the voices. This was about a policy that, by the way, as Secretary Paik said, was passed before I came here.

I've been very clear with many, many people in this room. You have given me, as Chancellor, policies to uphold in this university and I'm playing by those rules.

Liam (Undergraduate Student): So I would like to then point out that you yourself had tents up for Founders Day. It seems that the only like actual difference is the fact that we didn't fill out the form. So I would then like to ask out a second question, which is, do you think that, given, especially the violence enacted towards other student protesters, do you think it was appropriate, then, to call the police?

We can talk about the measure of it. There are photos that completely disagree with your side of the story. Do you think it was appropriate, then, to even call the police on your students for not filling out a form? Especially given the fact that you allowed tents on campus for your own Founders Day events.

Chancellor Reyes: The Founders Day event "tents" were not tents. They are canopies. By the way, those are the canopies that we use for tailgating. It is very different than a tent.

Liam (Undergraduate Student): I was asking if you think it's appropriate for calling police or threatening police violence against students not filling out a form.

Chancellor Reyes: Who approached the students first? Students, I am asking you, who approached the students first?

Liam (Undergraduate Student): Who approached us first? Administration, who then said that they were calling the police.

Chancellor Reyes: I'm not going to get into that. Everybody has the emails. The Administration responded. The Demonstration Response Team approached you and they said "please, you can stay, your demonstration can continue, but the tents have to come down."

If you want to continue to compare us to the actions taken by other institutions, I'm not going to sit here and debate that. No institution is having the conversation we're having here today, in this format. If none of you can call that progress, then I don't know what university we are.

Jen [No Last Name Given] (Undergraduate Student): I'm from the Psychology department. I first want to start my question by saying that some of the things that the Chancellor have been saying are not true. As someone who was witness to the amount of police on campus, and how prepared the police were to brutalize students.

My question is, have student organizations genuinely not offered and requested opportunities for peaceful discussions with Administration? And do you have proof that those conversations haven't or have happened?

Have student organizations such as the ones, protesting, not offered, and requested opportunities for peaceful discussions between you and their students?

Chancellor Reyes: Well, the email that we got is that you wanted us to record a planning meeting, and you were not going to address any changes in the format. We were only going to be there to talk about your demands in the format that you describe, and there was not going to be any more planning.

We said we would love to work with you to collaborate. Where we can have that conversation. Look at where we are. This is the venue that you have chosen to have the conversation.

Jen (Undergraduate Student): Well, first of all, I want to point out that this is a Faculty Senate meeting, and although it is open to students, it is not student based, and it's not student led. My other question is what the Administration's hesitancy is to having public and recorded meetings?

Chancellor Reyes: If we're recording a planning meeting, we're not planning. We're already having a conversation. You show me when our planning meeting has been recorded and what is the hesitation, the hesitation of the students to sit down with Administrations and faculty to have that planning meeting?

Unnamed Student: Excuse me if you would come here for a second. I have something I'd like to show you.

Senator Olsen: That's not the Chancellor. (*referring to Secretary Paik*)

Unnamed Student: I know, but he was he was speaking earlier, so I figured he would also like to respond.

Senator Olsen: He is not representing the Administration.

Unnamed Student: Okay, that's good to know, thank you. We have here a photo of some of the police at the encampment. We'd like you (the Chancellor) to come and count how many there were.

Liam (Undergraduate Student): We're asking directly the Chancellor, because he's the one who said there were only 4. It's flat out a lie, and we would like him to count how many police officers are present.

Chancellor Reyes: This is not the encampment. It is the parking lot.
(interruptions by unrecognized students)

Secretary Paik: Point of Order. This is the question and answer session. There are questions, and there are answers. Not yelling across the room.

Presiding Officer Brewer: Please treat all comments as directed to me, and then I will ask people to speak and recognize people to speak, to maintain an order. But it appears to me that we do not have any new people asking questions, and so at this point I would like to call the end of the question period.

Chancellor Reyes: It's not about a question anymore. If we're going to have a conversation, let's have a conversation, but not in this venue. If you're going to sit and talk about it with us, that's different. Are you gonna behave like this? Or when I walk across campus and you yell at me, and you don't want to meet with a team? This is a kind of conversation. But the answers that you're looking for, for some of the questions that you're looking for are not dependent on the venue. You wanted them in writing. They are in writing.

E. ANNUAL REPORTS

1. **2022-2023 Annual Report of the Athletic Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No 24-067**

   This Report was Received

2. **2022-2023 Annual Report of the Undergraduate Education Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-068**

   This Report was Received

3. **2022-2023 Annual Report of the Status of Diversity Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-069**

   This Report was Received

4. **2022-2023 Annual Report of the Status of Public Engagement and Outreach Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-070**

   This Report was Received

F. OLD BUSINESS: ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS

MOTION: **That the Faculty Senate approve the By-Law Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 19-24 24-043A.**

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate's Bylaws, this is the third of three readings of this motion. The motion may be amended at this meeting. The final vote will be taken at the 830th regular meeting.)

Secretary Paik read the motion.

MOTION 19-24 was Adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS: PROPOSED MERGER BETWEEN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AND DACSS

MOTION: **That the Faculty Senate approves the Merger of the School of Public Policy and DACSS, as 24-24 presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-071**

Secretary Paik read the motion.

MOTION 24-24 was Adopted.

H. NEW BUSINESS: COLLEGE-LEVEL REQUIREMENTS

MOTION: **That the Faculty Senate approves the Revision of the Commonwealth Honors College 25-24 Requirements, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-072**

Secretary Paik read the motion.

Voice vote determined to be insufficient.
A vote by show of hands was requested:

Aye: 16
Nays: 8

MOTION 25-24 was Adopted.

I. NEW BUSINESS: COURSES (CONSENT AGENDA)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

MOTION: 26-24 **That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANIMLSCI 221, ANIMLSCI 222, ART 673, ART 677, BCT 570CE-ENGIN 487, CE-ENGIN 687, CHEM 767, CHINESE 568, COMM 614, EDUC 601P, EDUC 622M, EDUC 634V, EDUC 682C, ECON 150, GERMAN 778, GEOGRAPH 664, HISTORY 245, HISTORY 329, HPP 825, JOURNAL 111, LINGUIST 205, LINGUIST 302, MUSIC 107, MUSIC 543F, MUSIC 543G, MUSIC 543K, NURSING 482/656, NURSING 483/657, NURSING 486/658, NURSING 659, POLISCI 772, PUBHLTH 448, PSYCH 256, PSYCH 322, SCH-MGMT 630, and SPANISH 394N as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education, and Graduate Councils.**

J. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (CONSENT AGENDA)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

MOTION: 27-24 **That the Faculty Senate approve (1) Creation of a Graduate Certificate in Program Evaluation Practice, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-073 (9772); (2) Revision to the Bachelor of Arts in Judaic Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-074 (10436); (3) Revision of the Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner (PMHNP) Degree within the Doctor of Nursing Practice Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-075 (11010); (4) Revision of the Dual Degree Program: Master of Education in Higher Education (M.Ed.)/ Master of Public Policy and Administration (MPPA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-076 (10520); (5) Revision of the Community Education and Social Change Concentration within the Bachelor of Arts in Education, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-077 (10884); (6) Revision of the Bachelor of Science in Veterinary Technology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-078 (9182); (7) Name Change of the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Studio Art to Arts and Design, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-079 (8053); (8) Name Change of the Bachelor of Science Degree in Resource Economics to Environmental and Natural Resource Economics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-080 (11156); (9) Revision of the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Middle Eastern Studies, as presented in the Sen. Doc. No. 24-081 (11526); (10) Creation of a Minor in Climate Science, as presented in the Sen. Doc. No. 24-082 (9834); (11) Creation of a Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Statistics and Data Science, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-083 (11405); (12) Creation of a Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Environmental Engineering, as presented in the Sen. Doc. No. 24-084 (11319); and (13) Creation of a Certificate in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-085 (8149).**

K. APPOINTMENTS TO FACULTY SENATE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

MOTION: **That the Faculty Senate approves the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and 28-24 Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. 24-086**

Secretary Paik read the motion.

MOTION 28-24 was Adopted.

Adjourned 6:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Anthony Paik, Secretary